REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Amendments have been made to the written description to correct typographical errors. Applicant respectfully notes that the amendments merely clarify the disclosed subject matter and do not add new matter in violation of the Patent Act.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 11-12, 19 and 21-22 have been amended. Claims 23-26 have been added and is presented for the Office's review. The amended claims are believed to either correct typographical errors or clarify Applicant's claimed subject matter. Neither the new claims nor the added claims are believed to add new matter.

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Alan Simpson's "Mastering WordPerfect 5.1 & 5.3 for Windows" ("Simpson"). Because Simpson fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claim language as clarified above, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Simpson is directed toward an explanation of different fonts and appearances offered in Microsoft's WordPerfect 5.1 and 5.3 software applications and how to adjust them for display on a screen and for printing. For instance, Simpson describes the difference between proportional and monospaced fonts (p. 137) and scalable and nonscalable fonts (pp. 137-138). In this discussion, Simpson explains that scalable fonts allow a user to select any particular font size (i.e., 11, 5.5, 2.2, etc.) on the fly while nonscalable fonts only allow a user to choose from a predetermined selection of sizes. Simpson also provides a summary of the mechanics for how a user might go about choosing a font using a variety of techniques supported by WordPerfect. (pp. 138-142). These techniques include using dialog boxes accessible from menus, using hidden codes, a ruler function, etc.. (pp. 138-142). Simpson also describes the use of relative type sizes where, for example, subscript and superscript font sizes may be maintained at a certain

percentage of the current body text such that if a user adjusts the body text, the subscript and superscript sizes are automatically adjusted. (pp. 142-146).

The cited portion of Simpson further discusses how to change the appearance of text for boldfaced, italicized, underlined text, etc. using pull down menus, dialog boxes, hidden codes, short-cut keyboard commands, etc. (pp. 146-151). Finally, Simpson teaches that text on a computer screen may be increased or decreased without affecting the printer output using a zoom feature of WordPerfect. (p. 1162). The zoom feature may be performed using a rules, button bars, menus, etc. and allow the user to select from a variety of magnification options (i.e., set values, manually-input values, to fit page width). (p. 1162).

Absent from Simpson is a discussion of automatically enlarging text as a window is enlarged. For example, Simpson does not appear to teach rendering an enlarged output display based on the magnification factor and rending within the enlarged output display an enlarged font character from the enlarged font set in substitute of the original font character. At best, Simpson teaches zooming the text within a Microsoft WordPerfect window having a fixed size. Assuming, solely for purposes of argument, that the zooming is based on a magnification factor and that zooming is equivalent to rendering an enlarged font character from the enlarged font set in substitute of the original font character, the cited portions of the Simpson are silent as to Applicant's claimed rendering an enlarged output display based on the magnification factor and the claimed aspect of rendering within the enlarged output display an enlarged font character from the enlarged font set ...." For at least this reason, claim 1 is believed to be allowable of the prior art.

Claims 2-6 and new claim 23 depend upon allowable claim 1 and are also believed to be in proper condition for allowance for at least this reason. However, it is respectfully submitted

that dependent claims 2-6 and new claim 23 further add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and are allowable for this reason as well. For instance, and with respect to new claim 23, Applicant claims that the output display corresponds to a window and that the rendering of the enlarged output display corresponds to rendering an enlarged window. Applicants note that Simpson appears to be silent as to rendering an enlarged window as claimed by Applicant (while also enlarging a font character), but instead appears to only teach the zooming of the font within a Microsoft WordPerfect window having a fixed size. For this reason and for those listed above the dependent claims should also be allowed over Simpson.

Claims 7-12 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Foley in view of Simpson. As for claim 7, for at least the reason that no combination of Foley or Simpson appears to teach or suggest "means for receiving a magnification event indicator, wherein the indicator includes a magnification factor; means for receiving a text call … for the generation of character generator …; and means for receiving an ancillary text call indicator … [and] further operative to receive the magnified character set… [and] … further operative to cache the magnified character set," claim 7 is believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Foley is directed toward programming in the Simple Raster Graphics Package (SRGP) and, more specifically, text drawing, types of fonts and font attributes supported in SRGP and the manner in which characters in a font are defined and clipped. (pp. 38-39, 127-131). Foley further states that it is possible to build a font cache on the fly by storing fonts in outline form and covert the ones being used in a given application to their bitmap equivalents. (p. 131). While Foley discusses the fact that building a font cache is possible and has certain advantages, Applicant respectfully notes that the claim is not rendered obvious merely based on the broad concept of font caching without any further explanation. Such a proposition ignores the claim language set

forth by Applicant. For purposes of example and turning merely to the last portion of claim 7, Applicant is unable to find any reference to a means for receiving an ancillary text call indicator from the means for receiving the magnification event indicator, wherein the means for receiving the ancillary text call is further operative to receive the magnified character set from the means for receiving the text call such that, in response to the ancillary text call indicator, the means for receiving an ancillary test call is further operative to cache the magnified character set. Because this is only one example of the Office Action's failure to address specific claim language and because Applicant is unable to find any reference in the cited prior art that would render obvious the claimed subject matter, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim is in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner maintains this rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner explain where the claimed features are taught or rendered obvious in the cited prior art by citing specific structure and providing detailed pinpoint citations thereto.

With respect to claim 19, Applicant respectfully resubmits the relevant remarks with respect to claim 7 while noting that the Office Action uses the same argument in allegedly rendering obvious similar subject matter. That is, claim 19 is a computer system claim generally having, among other limitations, similar limitations to those presented in claim 7. However, instead of using "means for" language, claim 19 includes, among other things, at least one storage medium including executable instructions associated with a message hook application, a character generator and a display driver wherein one or more processors are operative to execute the executable instructions associated with the message hook application, the character generator and the display driver, thereby causing the one or more processors, upon execution to, among other things, "generate a text call for the generation of a magnified character set", "generate the magnified character set in response to the text call", "generate an ancillary text call indicator",

and "to cache the magnified character set in response to the ancillary text call indicator." Thus, for the same or similar reasons as articulated above with respect to claim 7, claim 19 is also believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 8-12 and 20-22 depend upon allowable claims 7 and 19 are further believed to add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter not otherwise disclosed or suggested in the cited prior art. For at least this reason, the aforementioned claims are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

New Claims 24-26 are hereby presented for examination. As to new claim 24, Applicant respectfully notes that the claimed subject matter includes, among other things, a limitation directed to at least one storage medium including, among other things, executable instructions associated with a display driver such that when executed by the one or more processors, the one or more processors are operative "to enlarge the window of the GUI by an amount corresponding to the magnification factor and further operative to replace text associated with the window with the enlarged text", wherein the enlarged text is generated by a character generator, is associated with the text associated with the window of the GUI and has a size corresponding to the magnification factor. Thus, for at least the same reasons claim 1 is allowable over the Simpson and because Foley also does not appear to teach enlarging the window of the GUI by an amount corresponding to the magnification factor, new claim 24 is also believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

New claims 25-26 not only depend upon allowable claim 24 but are also believed to add additional novel, non-obvious and patentable subject matter. For at least these reasons, new claims 25-26 are also believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/6/09

By: _____
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005